BY MR. D. S. MALLAPPA, (Tiptur Taluk) and MR. G. K. MALLAPPA, (Tiptur Municipality).—

Q.—46. Will the Government be pleased to state:—

(1) The number of vacancies that occurred in the Electrical Department in the clerical and technical services since the year 1920-21 up to the current year.

(2) The number of vacancies that were advertised for purposes of recruitment.

(3) The various communities to which the candidates appointed to those vacancies belong.

(4) The instances wherein the Chief Electrical Engineer has preferred candidates with lower qualifications when there were candidates with higher qualifications for appointment?

SECRETARY TO GOVERNMENT, ELECTRICAL DEPARTMENT.—

A.—46. (1) Technical 34
Clerical 63

Total .. 97

(2) 29.

(3)

	Technical	Clerical	Total
Non-Brahmins ..	.. 14	45	59
Brahmins ..	.. 20	18	38
Total	.. 34	63	97

Remarks.—Mahomedans, 3; Adikarnatakas, 2; Christians, 5; Ursus, 2; and the rest to candidates belonging to Lingayet, Vokkaligar, Mudaliar, Naidu, etc., communities.

(4) In the case of all clerical appointments and one technical appointment to which members of backward communities were appointed, candidates of less but possessing the minimum qualifications were preferred to candidates possessing higher qualifications.

N.B.—The executive and ministerial establishment of the Electrical Department was re-organised in 1921 taking effect from 1st of June and it is not possible to compile the information required for the year 1920-21 and therefore the figures given are for the period from the 1st of July 1921 to the end of August 1927.

Representations.

No. 1.—Malnad Allowance to Menials.
Mr. B. Gopala Char, Thirthahalli Taluk.

MR. GOPALA CHAR brought to notice that the menials in the service of Government are not getting even what ordinary coolies were earning. He urged that the grant of a special locality allowance was more needed in their case than in that of officials.

MR. KESAVAIYA pointed out that the menials felt keenly disappointed that no allowance was sanctioned in their case and this had created a lot of heart-burning in them. He added that if the menials in the service of Government were given some small locality allowance, that would induce the local bodies also to give a similar concession to their own menial servants.

THE DEWAN replied that it was not possible to sanction any allowance in the case of menials. He thought that a better thing to do was to give suitable increases to their pay. Whether that was possible or not was a question which was engaging the attention of Government. He informed the House that an estimate of the probable increase in expenditure had been called for from the Comptroller.

No. 2.—Grant of house-building advance to Government servants.
Mr. C. Subba Rao, Chitaldrug Municipality

MR. C. SUBBA RAO referred to the Government order on the subject of house-building advances and said that the grant of one year's pay was no adequate encouragement to Government officials to build their own houses. He, therefore, requested that the special concession recently allowed in the case of officials living in the Cities of Bangalore and Mysore, should be extended to the others also.

Some other members invited special attention to the case of officials in the Malnad and said that a large number of houses were being burnt down in the Malnad due to constant fires, and that the grant of this concession was very necessary in their case.

THE DEWAN replied that so far as the officials in the Malnad were concerned, Government wanted to view the matter sympathetically.

Another Member observed that recently the Government had sanctioned the opening of new courts, in places where there were not houses enough for the officials to live in. He thought that the proper thing to do was, first, to make sure that accommodation was available and then open courts.

THE CHIEF JUDGE observed that Government could not take the responsibility of erecting any large number of houses in a particular case simply because the opening of a court was sanctioned in that place.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA referred to the case of Police Inspectors, Amildars and other officers, who were transferred from place to place. He suggested that the Government should see that an adequate number of houses were built for their use, if necessary, by starting a Building Society and giving it sufficient encouragement.

Another Member who supportedt his view, said that in the absence of quarters for Government officials, they would occupy Musafarkhanas and Travellers' Bungalows much to the inconvenience of other visitors. Some instances were quoted such as the Musafarkhana at Nanjangud, etc., where these were not made available to the visitors for years together. Some other members suggested that the conveniences created for Government officials should be uniform in all districts.

MR. D. S. MALLAPPA urged that no house-building advance should be sanctioned to any Government official without the levy of a suitable interest on it.

THE DEWAN replied that it was too much to expect the Government to afford all concessions throughout the State uniformly. He agreed that the case of the officials in the Malnad deserved sympathetic consideration to start with.

No. 3.—Rectification of certain defects in the State Life Insurance Committee Rules for Public Branch.

Mr. C. Subba Rao, Chitaldrug Municipality.

(i) MR. C. SUBBA RAO stated that the rate of premium as given in Table No. 3 offered policy-holders less attraction than the rates prevailing in private companies. Very often, they did not get bonds even for the amounts actually paid up. From the business point of view, this was a serious loss to them, and so Government Insurance business did not thrive as much as could be expected.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL observed that the rates of premia were based on actuarial calculations and that it was not a question of simply returning the amounts paid by policy-holders.

MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR and some other members observed that the result of such a position was that a very large amount of money went into the hands of outside companies and that it was not a wise policy for Government to allow it.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the business of insurance had to be conducted on approved lines

and so as not to adversely affect the fund, *i.e.*, the interests of the insured themselves.

(ii) MR. C. SUBBA RAO then said that whenever Government servants, who had insured their lives were absent on leave, the premium due from them in the official branch was recovered from their pay, and adjusted after their return to duty; but if the premium due from such officials in the Public Branch was not paid up during their absence on leave, the policy was allowed to lapse. He said that this was not just and that the same procedure should be adopted in the latter case in regard to adjustment of premium.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that it was not possible to treat differently the official and non-official insured of the Public Branch.

(iii) MR. C. SUBBA RAO then urged that at least one half of the members of the Insurance Committee should be non-officials. At present, the official element prevailed and there was no reason why it should be so in the case of the Public Branch.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that there were three non-officials on the Committee and that that was a sufficient representation of the insured of the Public Branch.

MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR observed that if the official element was allowed to predominate in the Committee, there was no real significance of running a Public Branch at all.

MR. SUBBA RAO then urged that if the concessions referred to could not be granted to Government officials in the Public Branch, the insured must be enabled to have their policies revived at least on production of a medical certificate.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the rules provided for such revival in their specified periods.

MR. T. NANJAPPA observed that if the premium rates were reduced, the number of insured would automatically increase. The competition between Government and private companies was very keen in this respect and it was up to the Government to offer sufficient inducements to the public to insure in the Public Branch.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL stated that expert advice would be obtained at the time of the next valuation as to whether the rates admitted of reduction.

MESSRS. T. NANJAPPA and BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR said that when the foreign insurance companies operating in the State were earning large profits with lower rates of

premia, it was not right on the part of Government to say that their own insurance rates could not be lowered. They suggested that the Actuary might be consulted over again. They also thought that the Public Branch was instituted solely with the object of preventing local money from going out as far as possible.

Mr. H. C. DASAPPA suggested the desirability of getting the opinions of the London Actuary verified locally.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that in a matter like this the best advice possible should be obtained.

MR. DASAPPA then observed that Government had been spending lots of money in getting Mysoreans trained in different branches of Science, etc., but no action had been taken to get at least a few Actuaries trained. He suggested that this should be done at least in the near future.

(iv) MR. SUBBA RAO then requested that policy-holders might be given the facility of crediting premium amounts in the Mysore Bank, necessary understanding being come to between them and the Government, with regard to adjustment of the same. In the absence of such an arrangement, the policy-holders were subjected to very many disabilities, and that policies were actually lapsing.

THE SECOND MEMBER OF COUNCIL said that Government would consult the Bank authorities on the subject.

No. 4.—Modification of Remission Rules.
Mr. H. Krishnamurthyachar, Mulbagal Taluk.

MR. H. KRISHNAMURTIACHAR prayed that half wet remission might be granted in the case of wet and garden lands below any particular tank if owing to inadequate supply of water, (i) half the atchkat could not be cultivated with wet crops, or (ii) if dry crops were raised or the outturn of wet crops raised was below 4 annas.

He also requested that each tank should be considered as the unit for purposes of remission. He observed that the recent order of Government on this subject was the result of representations from the people made during the last 30 years. The condition of tanks was so bad that even if they filled three or four times, the water was not enough to grow a single wet crop. He thought, therefore, that this subject deserved the immediate consideration of the Government.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA observed that an immediate modification of the remission rules on the lines suggested in the representation was absolutely necessary, if the raiyats should not be subjected to any real grievances in the future.

MR. L. VEMA REDDY brought to notice that there were no evidences of the sympathy of Government expressed by them in this respect for years past. Under the existing rules, assessment was remitted in one hobli and the same concession was not shown in an adjoining hobli in the same year. Though the question deserved very sympathetic consideration, yet the Government were merely safeguarding their own interests; and unless and until all the raiyats were made to live happily, no country could be called prosperous. It was for this reason that he appealed to the Government to issue immediate orders that the assesment should be remitted in the case of all lands under any given tank in case the crop raised was less than 4 annas.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that assessment in Mysore was levied on the basis of an average. Whenever the crop failed, the raiyats made loud representations for a remission of assessment. But, if the case were otherwise and the crops were plenty, they paid not a single pie extra to Government. If, therefore, the raiyats were agreeable to fixing assessments on the basis of average for the past 25 years or if they were agreeable to pay a higher assessment in good years, perhaps the representation could be considered.

MR. S. C. MALLAIYA observed that there was no justice in levying assessment in years in which the crops were not satisfactory, and that the rules so far issued in respect of remissions were not to the actual benefit of the people. The raiyats had certainly no objection for a higher assessment in case the crops were satisfactory. But that was not the case actually. As was evident from the repeated representations that were made in the Assembly from time to time, the only solution, he said, to the problem was to regard each tank as a unit for purposes of remission.

MR. PATTABHIRAMACHETTY observed that in British India wet assessment was remitted whenever the crops failed. Even in Mysore, remissions were being granted off and on. So that by accepting the representation, Government did not commit themselves to any loss of revenue.

MR. BELUR SRINIVASA IYENGAR explained that the failure of crops might be due either to want of rain or to the non-restoration of breached tanks. In the former case, he said, Government were granting remissions of half the assessment. He did not see any justice in withholding the same concession in the latter case also when lands could not be cultivated and crops could not be raised for want of water.

THE FIRST MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that the foremost and essential condition of remission of assessment was that the whole tract should be impoverished. He said that the case of a breached tank was quite different from failure of rains. Whereas in the former case, Government had the responsibility for restoring the tank, in the latter it was more or less a gamble between rain, raiyats and Government. In such cases, he said that the principles that applied in the case of breached tanks did not apply as the 30 years' assessment had been fixed after taking into consideration lean years also. Failure of crops in any one particular year in a given small area cannot be construed as having impoverished the tract. Remission could only be given under the rules only if a whole tract was impoverished. Of course, if the lands under any one tank came under that definition, there was nothing to prevent Government from granting remission.

MR. C. SUBBA RAO replied that it was within the power of Government to treat such a locality as being impoverished.

MR. L. VEMA REDDI brought to notice that the condition of tanks was not always correctly described in the reports submitted by local officials. He instanced the case of the Linganahalli Tank in the Malur Taluk which had breached more than 25 years ago, but it was reported throughout to have been in a good condition. The case of the Bundliki Nagikere in Siralkoppa Taluk was also quoted by some other member in this connection, and the members urged that the assessment levied from the raiyats of these areas should be refunded to the raiyats.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER replied that such cases would be noted for enquiry.

MR. RANGASWAMIENGAR of Magadi and MR. PATTI BASAPPA suggested that even without representations from the raiyats, the local officers must themselves inspect the tanks and submit reports with a view to getting the raiyats the required relief.

MR. SIDDALINGA DEVARU urged that the word "tract" occurring in the Rules should be immediately replaced by the word "tank" and that nothing more was desired.

THE DEWAN enquired if the question might not be referred to a small committee.

MR. SIDDALINGA DEVARU and many other members said that the question was very simple and that it should be decided immediately without any committee which necessarily meant a lot of delay.

MR. M. VENKATASAMI GOWDA (Malur Taluk) urged that the term "impoverished tract" occurring in the Remission Rules should be deleted and each tank should be considered the unit for purposes of remission, subject to the other conditions in the rules.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL suggested the formation of effective Tank Panchayets in each village which would be more competent to speak about the outturn of crops.

MR. H. C. DASAPPA was of the opinion that the apparent loss to be sustained by Government as a result of considering each tank as the unit might not exceed Rs. 10 lakhs and that this loss could be met from the benefit derived by the reduction of subsidy.

Another member represented that the subordinate officers should be given perfect freedom to give in their reports a true picture of the crops raised in each place without regard to its relation with the land revenue.

MR. E. KRISHNAPPA pointed out that the whole question of remission should be treated and disposed of as a general question and not according to the merits of each case.

THE DEWAN replied that the question of revising the remission rules was engaging the attention of Government and that a special committee would be appointed to go into its various aspects. At the suggestion of Mr. Belur Srinivasa Iyengar the Dewan agreed to having a non-official majority on this committee.

No. 5.—Disposal of Amarai produce to the villagers on average fixed value.

Mr. N. G. Lakshminarayana Reddi, Chickballapur Taluk.

It is prayed that the *amarai* produce in the villages be disposed of to the villagers themselves for the average of the realisations of the preceding five years, instead of auctioning it to the highest bidder every year.

In making the above representation, MR. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI said that by the arrangement suggested above not only would the Government get their revenue year after year, but also that the trees would be saved from deterioration. He was strongly of opinion that the whole village should reap the benefit of the *amarai*.

THE REVENUE COMMISSIONER said that *amarai* auctions were held once in three years and that the local people could bid and take the contract for that period.

MR. LAKSHMINARAYANA REDDI replied that the right was being sold every year and that it would be more advantageous if the contract were given for 5 years at a time on the average income realized for the preceding 5 years.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL explained that so far as the Kolar District was concerned, the tamarind trees had become a commercial crop yielding a large revenue to Government and that there was no reason why Government should forego a legitimate increase in this income, more especially as most of the trees have grown without the effort of the villagers.

MESSRS. VENKATASAMI GOWDA, RANGASWAMIENGAR and KRISHNAMURTHYACHARYA urged that the *amarai* should be sold for an upset price based on the average yield of the preceding five years and that it might be preferably sold to the Village Panchayets who might, in their turn, sublet the contract to the villagers.

MR. M. S. LINGE GOWDA pointed out that if the local people alone were given the contract they would take particular care of the trees which the outside contractor would not do. He was of opinion that the right may be sold locally to the Village Panchayets for 5 years on the average price of three previous years.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL doubted the feasibility of the last suggestion in view of the possibility of a loss to the Village Panchayets in subletting.

MESSRS. H. C. DASAPPA and S. C. MALLIAH thought that by entrusting the maintenance of trees to the panchayets and allowing them to utilise the *amarai* revenue, Government would be enabling the panchayets to spend more money on village improvement.

THE THIRD MEMBER OF COUNCIL replied that there were certain difficulties in the way of accepting the suggestion, *viz.*, that in the case of small villages with a few hamlets, the income from *amarai* might be considerable, while in bigger villages it might be very much less. It was necessary, therefore, that the income should go to the Government for being equitably distributed among all the villages.

MR. MAHOMED ABBAS KHAN thought that unless the Village Panchayets were made responsible for the sale of *amarai*, the planting and development of avenues would not thrive. He also urged that the *amarai* revenue which might amount to about Rs. 2 lakhs should be surrendered to the panchayets.

MR. MAHOMED SAIT suggested the formation of committees for each district for the sale of the *amarai*.

With a view to obviate the difficulties noted above, MESSRS. B. NARASINGA RAO, C. SUBBA RAO and VENKATESIAH suggested that such of the places in the Kolar and other districts as were yielding a large *amarai* might be treated as scheduled ones and their usufruct credited to Government and the *amarai* of the other places might be given away to the respective panchayets. This, they thought, would serve as an incentive to the panchayets to improve the growth of trees. They were also of the opinion that excepting the scheduled villages stated above, all the other Village Panchayets might be given the usual grants from Government.

THE DEWAN enquired whether it was understood that if *amarai* revenue was given away to the panchayets, the grant at present allotted for them might be reduced.

Several Members said that it should not be so. The Malnad members represented that their *amarai* income was very small and that the grant should not be reduced in the case of their panchayets.

The attention of the Assembly was then focussed on three main points, *viz.*,

(1) that the *amarai* should be given away to the local people at an upset price based on the average of the past 5 years for a period of 3 years;

(2) that it should preferably be given away to the panchayets on the same terms; and

(3) that the *amarai* derived in each panchayet should be surrendered to that panchayet and the Government grant to each to be reduced or increased proportionately to the income derived by each.

On a further discussion of each of the points, a large number of members opined that the existing state of things might continue for the present.

The Assembly rose for lunch and re-assembled at 3-30 P.M.

No. 58.—Fixing responsibility on all those that jointly execute bonds of various kinds until the debt is completely liquidated.

Messrs. M. Channabasappa, Molakalmuru Municipality and Patti Basappa, Molakalmuru Taluk.

MR. CHANNABASAPPA represented that at present only the debtor who paid a portion of the debt before the period of limitation fixed for the suit on the bond expired, would be liable to pay the balance of the debt and not the other

co-debtors who jointly executed the bond with him, and that this was not justifiable. He therefore prayed that the Civil Procedure Code might be amended so as to enforce joint liability on all the executors until the whole debt was discharged.

THE CHIEF JUDGE observed that if the creditors filed suits against all the concerned parties sufficiently before the expiry of the period of limitation, instead of waiting till then, there would be no room for some of the debtors who might have executed the bond, to escape the liability.

MR. MANNAJI RAO KADAM stated that under the existing rules, when the debt was acknowledged by one of the debtors, no action whatever could be taken against the other joint executors of the bond who therefore escaped their liability under the bond.

THE CHIEF JUDGE was of opinion that this difficulty might be overcome by the creditors insisting upon obtaining the acknowledgment of all the executors of the bond whenever any payment was made.

MR. DYAVE GOWDA thought that the adoption of the proposal would have the effect of unnecessarily increasing litigation.

MR. B. KESAVIAH and some other members were of opinion that the existing rule was sound enough and that it required no modification as suggested by the mover.

The representation was noted.

No. 59.—Cow-slaughter.

Messrs. P. N. Shankaraiya, Nagamangala Taluk and Puttananjaiya, Malavalli Municipality.

MR. SHANKARAIYA represented that a Regulation be passed preventing slaughter of cows in the State.

MR. G. B. RAGHAVENDRACHAR observed that no useful purpose would be served by a discussion on this subject until the report of the Cow Protection Committee appointed last year was published for the information of the public. He also requested their report might be made available to the public as early as possible.

MR. VEMA REDDY was also of the same opinion.

One of the members stated that such a Regulation was in force in Afghanistan and that it was high time that a Hindu State like Mysore introduced it.

MR. GURUMURTHYACHAR represented that the Regulation might be passed in commemoration of the Silver Jubilee of His Highness the Maharaja.

THE DEWAN observed that no action could be taken until the report of the Cow Protection Committee was received.

No 60.—Slaughter of Cattle.
Mr. B. M. Dyave Gowda, Belur Taluk.

Cattle are freely slaughtered in shandies. Action may kindly be taken to prevent this.

Vide reply to No. 59.

No. 61.—Minors' Properties.
Messrs. B. Devappagowda and Igoor Puttegowda, Manjarabad Taluk.

MR. DEVAPPAGOWDA represented that as the Court of Wards Regulation was not in force in Mysore, there was scope for minors' properties being misappropriated and prayed that Government might take over the management of the properties of minors. He also stated that in the past, the Amildars used to take charge of the properties of the minors in the taluk, appoint an agent for their management till the minors reached the age of majority and then hand over the properties to them, and that the same system might be reintroduced.

THE CHIEF JUDGE observed that what was most important was that the Deputy Commissioner or some one in the locality should move on behalf of the minor. In other words, it was the administrative action that was needed and it would certainly be taken. He was also of opinion that the introduction of the Court of Wards Regulation would not be of any great help in solving this problem.

MR. C. SUBBA RAO stated that there was no agency at present to bring to the notice of the authorities such cases and that arrangements might be made to report such cases to the Deputy Commissioners and Amildars for needful being done.

MR. S. VENKATESIAH said that the object of the representation was that the Deputy Commissioner should take action on behalf of the minor. At present, such action was not taken. He instanced a case in respect of which the Deputy Commissioner of a district did not make any enquiries and took no steps to safeguard the properties of a minor which amounted to nearly 1½ lakhs of rupees and as a result of this, the uncle of the minor took possession of the whole property and mismanaged it. In such cases, the Deputy Commissioners should promptly interfere and safeguard the interests of the minors. Such a thing was regularly being done in Coorg.

THE DEWAN observed that the representation would be considered.

No. 62.—Amendment of Order XXXIV of Rule 5, Civil Procedure Code.

Messrs. M. C. Lingegowda, Mandya Taluk; B. S. Puttaswami, T. Narasipur Taluk; Mahomed Hussain *alias* Sabjan, Hunsur Taluk; Gurukar Nanjappa and Patel Subbaiya, Gundlupet Taluk; Patel Lingegowda and S. Thimmaiyagowda *alias* Thimmegowda, Krishnarajpete Taluk; Bale Siddalinga Setty, Yedatore Taluk; Chikkegowda, Malavalli Taluk; V. Bandaiya, Nanjangud Taluk; and N. Siddalinga Devaru, Seringapatam Taluk.

MR. B. S. PUTTASWAMI represented that if applications for the passing of final decrees in civil suits filed for the recovery of amounts given on mortgage bonds were rejected for some reason or other, no applications for re-consideration were being entertained on the ground that there was no legal sanction for doing so. As it was very inconvenient to parties, he requested that the Civil Procedure Code be suitably amended so as to provide for the re-entertainment of such petitions within a period of three years. He also drew attention to the recent decisions in the British Indian High Courts to the effect that if an application for final decree was rejected, a second application of the same nature was barred, and wanted that the Civil Procedure Code should be amended to enable parties to file second and subsequent applications.

MR. C. SUBBA RAO was of opinion that the existing rule required no change.

THE CHIEF JUDGE said that no legislative action need be taken merely because the British Indian Courts expressed a certain opinion and that until a specific case was taken to the Mysore Chief Court, and their decision obtained, no necessity seemed to arise for the amendment of the rule as proposed. He pointed out that the Laws' Delays Committee had recommended the passing of a single decree in hypothecation suits and if that recommendation was given effect to, the grievance now put forward would not arise.

No. 63.—Exemption from punishment for bribery.

Mr. S. C. Malliah, Mandya Taluk.

MR. MALLIAH requested that orders be issued exempting from punishment those who bribed Government officers and came out with the fact of their having done so in public. He said that the procedure laid down in the Indian

Penal Code to punish both the receiver and the giver of the bribe was unjust. In his opinion only the man who received the bribe should be punished. People were ignorant of the rules and thought that it was their duty to pay something for the work done for them. It would be a great help to the people if they were exempted from punishment for offering bribes until they realised their duties and responsibilities. For fear of punishment for having offered bribes, many cases of bribery had been hushed up and the representation if accepted by Government and given effect to would help a good deal in bringing cases of bribery and corruption to the notice of higher authorities.

MR. B. KESAVIAH opposed the representation on the ground that if it was given effect to, the consequence would be that a person would offer a bribe for getting some work done, and after getting what he wanted, he would report the matter to the concerned authorities with the result that he would get his work done and at the same time get the person who received the bribe punished. This would give rise to very many difficulties and therefore should not be supported.

MR. S. N. M. RAZVI observed that the representation referred only to Government officers and that it was an insult to them to say that only they received bribes. There were many local institutions in the State the presidents and the members of which were liable to yield to the temptation of bribery. If a rule was made, it must be made applicable to both officials and non-officials who held offices.

The representation was noted.

No. 64.—Prevention of the use of cows for the plough and cart.

Messrs. S. L. Mannaji Rao Kadam, Minority Interests and P. Subbarama Setty, Mysore Chamber of Commerce.

MR. MANNAJI RAO KADAM represented that as cattle were necessary to the raiyats for the development of agriculture, Government should take necessary steps to prevent the using of cows for the plough and the cart. He said that under the guise of using dry cows for the plough, milch cows were being used with very baneful effects. He was of opinion that some legislative measure should be taken for empowering Patels and Shanbhogues to bring the delinquents to book.

MR. VEERARAJ URS and several others supported this view and added that a Regulation was in force in the neighbouring British Provinces preventing such abuses.

MR. B. S. RANOJI RAO said that if such a measure were enforced, there would be quarrels and free fights among the villagers and Patels would be afraid to report any cases of offences.

MESSRS. CHENNABASAPPA, SIDDALINGA DEVARU, M. S. LINGE GOWDA, B. LINGE GOWDA and others were opposed to passing a measure of the kind proposed. They said that it was only very poor raiyats with small holdings who could not afford to maintain bullocks that used their barren cows for ploughing and such cases were few. The passing of a Regulation of the kind suggested would cause a great deal of hardship to such raiyats. They added that no raiyat used milch cows for ploughing.

Some members also said that the moment a measure of the kind suggested was passed, the raiyats would be at the mercy of the Patels and Shanbhouges and cultivation would seriously be hampered.

MR. VEMA REDDY observed that in the Kolar District many raiyats were using milch cows for the plough and that some action was necessary to prevent it. He was of opinion that such use should be treated as an offence under Cruelty to Animals Act and the persons committing the offence punished suitably.

MR. M. C. LINGE GOWDA suggested that the Economic Superintendents and local men of the stamp of Mr. Vema Reddy might deliver useful lectures to the raiyats on the subject and prevent raiyats from using cows for ploughing. He thought that such a course would be more effective than passing a Regulation.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA of Malur differed from this view and said that no amount of lecturing would persuade the raiyats to effectively put an end to this practice.

MESSRS. KRISHNAMURTI ACHAR and GURUMURTHYACHAR supported Mr. Venkataswami Gowda.

MR. H. B. GUNDAPPA thought that Village Panchayets might be empowered to deal with such offences instead of Patels and Shanbhogues.

MR. VENKATESIAH remarked that using cows for ploughs and carts was a capital offence in the past.

MR. RAZVI observed that at a time when there was an agitation for the wholesale prevention of cow-slaughter in the State on religious sentiments as well as on economic grounds, it was not right on the part of the raiyats to torture the cows by making them draw carts and by yoking

them to the ploughs and bring about their death. In his opinion, killing the cows would be much better than subjecting them to a slow process of death. When Hindus wanted to put a stop to cow-slaughter by legislation, it was strange that 90 per cent of the raiyats who were Hindus worshipping the cow could not come to some understanding amongst themselves and achieve much more than a Regulation could prevent. In this view, he hoped that the mover would withdraw his representation.

THE DEWAN said that the question of amending the Cruelty to Animals Regulation to give effect to the proposal would be considered.

No. 65.—Enhancement of power of Village Munsiffs.
Messrs. J. S. Malkappa and J. B. Khasim Sab, Jagalur Taluk.

At present the Village Munsiffs are empowered to take up cases to the extent of Rs. 20 and as such the work is not being done satisfactorily. It is prayed that they may be empowered to deal with cases to the extent of Rs. 50.

The subject was not discussed as there was a Bill before the House on the subject.

No. 66.—Speedy disposal of Civil Suits.
Mr. H. Krishnamurthyachar, Mulbagal.

As there has been considerable delay in the disposal of civil suits in respect of the issue of processes and the execution of proceedings, it is prayed that the existing rules of procedure be suitably amended in order to facilitate the speedy disposal of civil suits.

Not discussed, as orders have been passed on the Laws' Delays Committee's Report, recently.

No. 67.—Abolition of the appointment of non-officials as Chairmen of the Bench Magistrates' Courts.
Mr. S. Venkataswami Gowda, Malur Taluk.

MR. VENKATASWAMI GOWDA represented that at present one of the non-official gentlemen selected as Bench Magistrates was being appointed as Chairman and that in most of the cases, the men appointed to the place were thoroughly inexperienced and created unnecessary ill-feeling and quarrels by their actions. He therefore prayed that the system of appointing non-official gentlemen be abolished and the Amildar made *ex-officio* Chairman of the Bench with non-officials as colleagues.

The proposal was vehemently opposed by a very large number of members.

MESSRS. VENKATASWAMY GOWDA of Goribidnur, RANGASWAMY IYENGAR, BHASKARAPPA and many others said that it was a much priced privilege that the non-officials were able to obtain from Government and that it was not proper to condemn the whole scheme merely because it did not work satisfactorily in a few places owing to selection of members to the Bench being carelessly made.

MR. SUBRAMA SETTY felt very sorry to hear from the mover that non-officials were unfit to hold the position to Chairmen of Bench Magistrates' Courts when such men in British India were being appointed even as Ministers. When there was a cry for Swaraj all over India, it was not right to suggest that the non-officials should be deprived of the small privileges they received at the hands of Government. He appealed to the mover to withdraw the representation.

MR. GURUMURTHYACHAR remarked that the Chairmen of the Bench Courts might be elected instead of being chosen from among the Bench of Magistrates. This view was, however, not supported by other members.

THE CHIEF JUDGE observed that the scheme was sanctioned by Government at the express desire of the public and with a view to relieve the Amildar, a touring officer, of this work. It was not right therefore to go back on the scheme. He was of opinion that it worked well in many places and with a little more care on the part of the District Magistrates in the selection of the candidates to the Bench, it was sure to work very satisfactorily.

At this stage, the Assembly rose for the day to meet again at 12 noon on Monday the 10th October.